

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/765,594	AOTA ET AL.	

All Participants:

(1) Ernesto Garcia.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) Thomas J. Bean.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2 March 2007

Time: 3:16pm

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

1 and 10

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner called to clarify ambiguities with the language of claims 1 and 10. In particular, claim 1 was discussed to clarify a double inclusion of a plate body and a supported portion being between the locking body and the shaft joint at the same time. Claim 10 was discussed to clarify that a projection is respectively fitted in the shaft joint body and the locking body and not that one projection fits in both the locking body and the shaft joint. A clean copy of revised claim 1 was provided to the examiner via facsimile. The examiner's amendment corresponds to the clean copy of claim 1.